

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

APRIL PREMO WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA WORKERS  
COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD, et  
al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00302 KJM AC

ORDER


Plaintiff, appearing in pro se, filed a complaint and paid the filing fee on February 17, 2022. ECF No. 1. That same day, a scheduling order was issued in this case ordering the plaintiff to serve a copy of the scheduling order and complete service of process within 90 days of filing the complaint. ECF No. 3 at 1. Plaintiff was cautioned that failure to complete service within 90 days may result in dismissal pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 40(m). Id. Plaintiff did not timely complete service, and on May 24, 2022, the court issued an order to show cause why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, noting that filing affidavits of service would discharge the order. ECF No. 4.

On June 6, 2022, plaintiff filed a document labeled “notice” which, along with affidavits of service, asked the court for direction regarding the litigation of her claims. ECF No. 5. The court cannot answer the questions plaintiff asks because it would require the court to give legal

1 advice. To receive such advice, plaintiff must contact an attorney, utilize her local law library, or  
2 seek out other resources for pro se litigants. The court cannot provide legal advice or instruct  
3 plaintiff on how to prosecute her claims.

4 Because plaintiff filed affidavits of service, the order to show cause (ECF No. 4) is  
5 DISCHARGED.

6 DATED: June 8, 2022

7   
8 ALLISON CLAIRE  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28